

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 02 2009

**ANGELA M. BRUNETTI, PLLC**

11300 East Caribbean Lane  
Scottsdale, Arizona 85255  
(480) 200-2054 Telephone  
(480) 513-9354 Facsimile

TO: Examiner Hugh M. Jones  
Art Unit 2128

*Phone (571) 272-3781  
Fax (571) 273-8300*

FROM: Angela Brunetti  
Reg. No. 41,647

RE: Examiner Interview Request for 10/707,365 proposed argument for discussion.

NUMBER of PAGES: Three (3) including this cover sheet.

MAR 02 2009

PTOL-413A (01-09)

Approved for use through 02/28/2009. OMB 0651-0031  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/707,365

First Named Applicant: Kenneth Boyd

Examiner: Hugh M. Jones

Art Unit: 2128

Status of Application: Final Rejection

## Tentative Participants:

(1) Angela M. Brunetti  
(3) \_\_\_\_\_(2) Examiner Hugh M. Jones  
(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Date of Interview: Week of 3/2/09

Proposed Time: 10:00 AM EST AM/PM

## Type of Interview Requested:

(1)  Telephonic      (2)  Personal      (3)  Video ConferenceExhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated:  YES  NO

If yes, provide brief description: Summary of explanation in response to Advisory Action dated 2/18/09

## Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Rej.</u>	<u>1-3,7-12,16-29</u>	<u>Pallot</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

 Continuation Sheet Attached

## Brief Description of Argument to be Presented:

See Continuation Sheet

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on \_\_\_\_\_

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature  
Angela M. BrunettiTyped/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative  
41,647

Registration Number, if applicable

Examiner/SPE Signature

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

U.S. Serial No. 10/707,365

9

Atty. Docket No. 81044284

DRAFTREMARKSDRAFT

In the Advisory Action the Examiner remarked that Applicant's arguments were not persuasive. Specifically, the Examiner asserted that the act of "avoiding understeering" does not mean that the understeering hasn't begun, and instead means that corrective action is taken when the onset of understeering is detected, and that understeering is thus avoided.

Applicants respectfully disagree and assert that the Pallot reference does not teach the detection of understeering. It is respectfully asserted that the Pallot reference teaches detecting a potential onset of tire saturation. Therefore, if understeering occurs as the result of a vehicle parameter not related to tire saturation, it will not be detected or addressed according to the teachings of Pallot. Further, the Pallot reference teaches taking corrective action upon the detection of a threshold limit being reached, and that threshold limit applies to tire saturation, not understeering. The tire saturation threshold limit taught by Pallot is set to prevent the occurrence of tire saturation, thereby avoiding the occurrence of understeering altogether.

The Examiner also indicated that it is not clear how corrective action could be taken if the onset of understeering is not detected.

Applicants assert that because Pallot is teaching the detection of a limit for tire saturation that is reached before tire saturation occurs, that corrective action may be taken in advance of the occurrence of tire saturation. Therefore, corrective action taken to prevent tire saturation will have the result of avoiding any effects of tire saturation, one of which may be understeering.

Finally, the Examiner stated that, for the sake of argument and considering Applicants' arguments, the ability to allegedly prevent understeering before it can occur presupposes a model of understeering, such as referred to in Pallot at column 8, lines 21-24.

Applicants respectfully assert that because Pallot is directed to detecting a threshold limit for tire saturation, and not detecting understeering, that it does not presuppose a model of understeering as asserted by the Examiner. It is respectfully asserted that the Pallot reference presupposes a model of tire saturation and not a model of understeering as claimed in the present invention.

DRAFT